

Review of: "Toxicological evaluation of aqueous extracts of *Clematis hirsuta* and *Rhamnus prinoides*"

Izuchukwu Okafor¹

¹ Nnamdi Azikiwe University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments: The paper highlights basic evidence to show safety prospects of two common plants aqueous extract. However, the grammar should be improved, and the text should be well formatted. The paper should be accepted for publication following the corrections of the identified

Abstract: there should be clarity in the method section, indicating the number of animals used, dosage of extract administered, administration period, method of animal sacrifice, etc. The result section should also feature the quantitative variables for each stated effect and their p-values.

Background: Are there no studies that observed any form of toxicity (visavis the variables observed in this present study) with the two plants? These should be added, and a justification should be made for the current study before stating the study aim.

Method: Listing the equipments in this section is not conventional, except for more specific 'special' procedures which are not routine. You can decide to ass such list as supplementary material.

You should add the herbarium number of the plants if they are availsble to ensure replicability of the study. It will be good to clearly state the number of groups used for the acute toxicity testing. 5 rats per group does not align with the 21 total number stated.

You should state the exact dosages given to each group of animal for each plant extract and each toxicity test.

More details of the biochemical and haematological procedures should be written in seperate sections. The fate of the animals used should be clearly state. You should also state the mode of administration and the instrument used (eg: cannula).

Did you carry out any phytochemical analysis of the plants? It is important to add such data, in order to put your output in consent.